

30 C.F.R. § 56.14003 because the guard on the head pulley was not of sufficient length to protect against a pinch point. The violation was assessed at \$294, and the parties propose to settle for \$20 because "Defendant states that this head pulley is 8' above the ground." Does the government accept this statement? If it is impossible to reach the pinch point, why was the citation issued? The motion does not provide justification for the settlement. Therefore the motion is DENIED.

Docket No. GENT 86-65-M contains 20 alleged violations originally assessed at \$1141. The parties propose to settle for \$804. Eleven of the violations were treated as "single penalty assessments" and assessed at \$20 each. The motion states that the parties agree that the proposed penalties for these violations are appropriate. I concur. Citation 2662166 charged a violation of 30 C.F.R. § 56.14008B because of a bench grinder without a tool rest. It was assessed at \$79 and the motion states that the parties agree that the violation occurred and the proposed penalty was appropriate. I concur. Citation 2662178 charged a violation of 30 C.F.R. § 56.12025 because of a loose ground wire and improper fittings in the coarse conveyor box. It was assessed at \$63, and the parties agree that the violation occurred and the proposed penalty was appropriate. I concur. Citation 2661182 charging a violation of 30 C.F.R. § 56.14001 because of an unguarded tail pulley was assessed at \$147. The parties propose to settle for \$110 because the violation "was over-evaluated by the inspector." This statement does not justify the proposed reduction. With respect to citations 2661183 (the violation was originally assessed at \$105, the proposed settlement is for \$78), 2661187 (originally assessed at \$112; proposed settlement \$20), 2662171 (originally assessed at \$79; proposed settlement \$60), 2662175 (originally assessed at \$79; proposed settlement \$20), the motion provides justification for the proposed settlement, and I will approve it. With respect to citations 2662169 (charging a violation of 30 C.F.R. § 56.12030 because of exposed electrical conductors and a leaking fuel valve, originally assessed at \$178; proposed settlement \$134) and citation 2662176 (charging a violation of 30 C.F.R. § 56.11012 because of an open hole in the floor of the generator trailer, originally assessed at \$79; proposed settlement \$20), the motion does not justify the proposed settlement and I will DENY it.

Docket No. CENT 86-66-M contains three citations, two of which charged violations assessed as "single penalty assessments" at \$20 each. The parties propose to settle these violations for the assessed amounts, and I will approve the settlement. Citation 2661186 charges a violation of 30 C.F.R. § 56.11001 because of an opening in a berm at the dump of the crusher feeder and hopper. It was originally assessed at \$112